

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 16, 20 – 25, 27, 28, 31 and 32 are pending for consideration in the present application upon entry of the instant amendment, which is respectfully requested. Claims 9, 17 – 19, 26, 29 and 30 were previously canceled. Claim 1 and 8 are independent claims.

Applicants note that the Office Action Summary states the status of the Office Action as “non-final”; however, on page 6 of the Office Action, the Office Action was identified as “Final”. For purposes of this amendment, Applicants assume the Office Action was final. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the present amendment, since the present amendment is in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(3) and, further, places this application in condition for allowance by adopting the Examiner’s suggestion regarding allowable subject matter.

In the event the present amendment fails to place the present application in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of finality of the Final Office Action since Applicants believe the previous amendment, filed with a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 on March 28, 2011, would not have been properly finally rejected on the grounds and art of record if they were entered in the application prior to the filing of the RCE. In addition, in the event the present amendment fails to place the present application in a condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the Applicants’ representative at the telephone number provided below.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 8, 10 – 16, 20 – 25, 27, 28, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE 29706969 U1. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims. Applicants note with appreciation that, on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner identified allowable subject matter. In particular, the Examiner suggested that Applicants delete the alternative limitation “‘or is associated with a connective device disposed at the coupling location for connection of the intelligent unit,’ from claim 1, and make the same changes to claim 8 in order to distinguish over DE 29706969 U1.”


Applicants are amending each of claims 1 and 8 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants submit that DE 29706969 U1 does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 8.

Claims 2 – 7 and 31 depend from claim 1. Claims 10 – 16, 20 – 25, 27, 28 and 32 depend from claim 8. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 2 – 7, 10 – 16, 20 – 25, 27, 28, 31 and 32 are also not anticipated by DE 29706969 U1.

Applicants are requesting reconsideration and a withdrawal of the section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 – 8, 10 – 16, 20 – 25 and 27, 28, 31 and 32.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John Yankovich  
Reg. No. 42,240

Attorney for the Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: 203-327-4500  
Fax: 203-327-6401

12 Jun 2011

Date